UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,972	04/08/2004	Kenneth E. Bailey JR.	030621	9539
41835 7590 02/07/2007 KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART PRESTON GATES ELLIS LLP HENRY W. OLIVER BUILDING 535 SMITHFIELD STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15222			EXAMINER	
			MARCANTONI, PAUL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TTTTODORGIT			1755	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAVS		02/07/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Autieur Occurrence	10/820,972	BAILEY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Paul Marcantoni	1755				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 Ap	ril 2004					
, ==	•					
· _ ·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
. —	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
dee the attached detailed office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.						
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	· _					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, 					

Application/Control Number: 10/820,972

Art Unit: 1755

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-7,10,15,18-23, and 26-33, drawn to a starch, classified in class 536, subclass 102.
- II. Claims 8,16, 24, and 34, drawn to a gypsum slurry, classified in class 106, subclass 772.
- III. Claims 9,17, 25, and 35, drawn to a gypsum wallboard ("drywall"), classified in class 52, subclass 344+.
- IV. Claims 36-45, drawn to a method of making a starch composition, classified in class 106, subclass 125.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II and I and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product (starch) is deemed to be useful as another materially different process such as a composition for adhesives, paper coating binder, moisture barriers in packaging, etc. and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions I and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2)

Art Unit: 1755

that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the acid starch product can be made by a materially different process using different acid for treatment of starch, different amounts, and different treating temperatures than those claimed.

Note: These Groups I and IV could potentially be rejoinable under In re Ochiai but that requires selection of the product (starch of Group I) and upon allowance of the Group I product claims the process claims to rejoined must be of the same exact scope.

Inventions II and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a quick set cement, Portland cement retarder, soil conditioner, molds, surgical casts, etc. and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions II and IV and III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different designs, modes of operation, and effects and are patentably distinct as shown by their mutually exclusive characteristics. Starch itself does not need to be used in a process of making a gypsum slurry and/or later to be used for wallboard (drywall) but can be used as an adhesive or many other uses starches are conventionally known for usage in the art.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/820,972 Page 5

Art Unit: 1755

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Marcantoni whose telephone number is 571-272-1373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Marcantoni Primary Examiner Art Unit 1755